



Longman

Focus on ELT Materials



Editor

Jayakaran Mukundan

Longman

Focus on ELT Materials

Editor

Jayakaran Mukundan



PEARSON
Longman

PEARSON MALAYSIA SDN. BHD. (4409-W)
Lot 2, Jalan 215, Off Jalan Templer,
46050 Petaling Jaya, Selangor Darul Ehsan.
Tel : 03-77820466, 77820803
Fax : 03-77818005

Associated companies, branches and representatives throughout the world

© Pearson Malaysia Sdn. Bhd. 2006

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the Copyright owner.

First published 2006

ISBN 983 74 3930 0

Focus on ELT Materials

Text set in 10/14 pt. Palatino.
Printed by Gains Print Sdn. Bhd.,
Selangor Darul Ehsan.

Preface

The articles in this collection are papers presented at the **First International Conference on English Language Teaching (ELT) Materials**. The conference, which is the first SIG on materials in Malaysia, was held in Melaka in April 2005. The *Malaysia International Centre for English Language Teaching (MICELT)*, Faculty of Educational Studies, UPM is grateful to the materials experts who participated in the conference. Brian Tomlinson (founder of the *Materials Development Association – MATSDA*), Hitomi Masuhara (co-founder of *MATSDA*), Alan Maley, Bao Dat, Jane Spiro, Tan Bee Tin, Chaz Pugliese and Marc Helgesen were among those who presented papers and conducted workshops for the participants at the conference, comprising mainly school teachers.

The conference came about as a result of strong encouragement from Pearson Malaysia. *MICELT* is grateful to Pearson Malaysia for sponsoring all the foreign speakers and for helping to sponsor the participation of some teachers at the conference. We are also thankful to Pearson Malaysia for publishing selected papers presented at the conference.

Jayakaran Mukundan

Editor

Contents

Preface.....	iii
About the Contributors.....	vi
Maths, Science and English Teachers in the Same Boat? The Multi-Dimensional Awareness Approach to Content Teaching.....	1
<i>Hitomi Masuhara</i>	
Exploration of WordSmith 3.0 as a Textbook Writer's Guide and as an Evaluation Instrument.....	12
<i>Jayakaran Mukundan and Anealka Aziz Hussin</i>	
The First General English Intensive Course for Faculty Members of Non-English Departments at a Private University in Indonesia: Overall Evaluation.....	25
<i>Flora Debora Floris</i>	
ELT Materials: Do Policy and Implementation Reflect Pedagogic Sense?.....	39
<i>Jayakaran Mukundan</i>	
Looking for a Diamond in a Mountain of Rocks: The Challenge for Teachers.....	44
<i>Azaharee Abdullah and Noor Anita Mohamed</i>	
Developing EFL Materials for Local Markets: Issues and Considerations.....	52
<i>Bao Dat</i>	
Developing Classroom Materials for Teaching to Learn.....	77
<i>Brian Tomlinson</i>	
Teaching Out-of-the-Box: Creativity in the Classroom.....	83
<i>Chaz Pugliese</i>	
First-time Verbs in the Syllabus Wordlist: A Tale of Misses in the Textbook.....	96
<i>Dulip Singh Ranjet Singh and Jayakaran Mukundan</i>	
A Study on the Use of Internet Resources as Language Teaching Materials.....	114
<i>Mohamad Fadhili Yahaya, Azaharee Abdullah and Mohd Asri Mohd Noor</i>	

An Evaluation of Students' Course Package Used for Learning English in Malaysian Primary Schools.....	126
<i>Mohd Asri Mohd Noor, Azaharee Abdullah and Mohamad Fadhili Yahaya</i>	
Let's Get Physical – Warm-up Activities Involving Movement and Language.....	132
<i>Marc Helgesen</i>	
From Students to Students: Adapting Technical Reports as Classroom Materials.....	152
<i>Safiah Sidek, Sharimllah Devi Ramachandran and Rita Abdul Rahman Ramakrishna</i>	
Reader's Digest and Speaking Journal: What Can Both Do for Your Students?.....	164
<i>Samsiah Abdul Hamid</i>	
Nurturing Social Awareness Through Project Work in the ESL Classroom.....	177
<i>Sheela Paramasivam and Kaarthiyaini Supramaniam</i>	
Using Teaching Portfolios to Shape Practice.....	187
<i>Shiocharan Kaur and Saratha S. N.</i>	
Interaction-Oriented Design for Developing Instructional Materials.....	197
<i>Siti Mina Tamah</i>	
Student-Teacher-Made Language Teaching Materials: A Developmental Approach to Materials Development.....	207
<i>Tan Bee Tin</i>	
The Use of Authentic Materials in ESL Classrooms – Some Practical Suggestions.....	228
<i>Tan Lee Hoon</i>	
Doing Things with Texts.....	236
<i>Alan Maley</i>	

About the Contributors

Alan Maley has been a frequent visitor to Malaysia. He is currently Visiting Professor at UKM, Bangi. He has worked in ELT for over 40 years, in 10 countries, including PR China, India, Thailand and Singapore. He is a prolific writer with over 30 books to his credit, and numerous articles. He is also series editor for the *Oxford Resource Books for Teachers*, which has over 30 titles. His main current interests are in creative writing, creative materials design and teacher development.

Azaharee Abdullah is a lecturer with Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia (UiTM) at the Arau Campus, Perlis Indera Kayangan. He received his BA (Hons) in English and Computer Science from Universiti Sains Malaysia, Pulau Pinang and MSc in TESOL from University of Stirling, Scotland. His current research interests include Syllabus and Materials Development and Evaluation, Technology Assisted Language Learning and Teaching, Computer Supported Collaborative Work for Teaching and Learning, Human Computer Interaction, Information Design, Usability and Web Design for Teaching and Learning Systems. He loves cooking for family and friends. He is presently living in a delightfully rustic kampung in the Shangrila city-state of Perlis Indera Kayangan.

Bao Dat received his PhD in Applied Linguistics from Leeds Metropolitan University and has taught at the National University of Vietnam and the National University of Singapore. He is presently teaching in the MA-ELT Programme at Assumption University, Thailand. He has published widely in major books and international journals, and has given presentations at international conferences in Asia, Europe and North America. His research interests include classroom reticence in Asia, creative adaptation of course materials, cross-cultural issues in ELT, learner contribution in ELT methodology and innovative action research for teacher development. He is also an illustrator for ELT materials and has provided visual illustrations for many ESL/EFL coursebooks published in Singapore, Hong Kong and Beijing.

Brian Tomlinson is a Reader in Language Learning and Teaching at Leeds Metropolitan University, where he is Head of the Post-Graduate, Research and Consultancy Unit in the School of Languages. He has worked in Japan, Indonesia, Nigeria, Singapore, UK, Vanuatu and Zambia and has given presentations in over forty countries. He is Founder and President of MATSDA (International Materials

Development Association) and has published many articles and books (e.g. *Discover English*, *Openings*, *Superbird*, *Materials Development in Language Teaching*, *Developing Materials for Language Teaching* and *Developing Language Course Materials*). He is currently working on *Language Acquisition and Development: Studies of Learners of First and Other Languages* (Continuum) and on *World Wide Readers* (a series of web readers he is editing with Alan Maley). Brian has also worked as a soccer coach and loves to travel, listen to jazz, read and write fiction and experience new food and drinks.

Chaz Pugliese is a freelance teacher and teacher trainer. He has worked in the US, the UK and the Czech Republic, and he lives in Paris with his family. Chaz holds a master's degree (TESOL), a Post-Graduate Dip. (TESOL), the Trinity Dip. (TESOL) and the CELTA, but considers his most eye-opening educational experience the time spent studying Multiple Intelligences Theory. A regular presenter at international conferences, Chaz has written for several professional journals, and since 2002, has enjoyed editing the Activity column for the IATEFL newsletter (*Voices*). Apart from Multiple Intelligences Theory, Chaz is deeply interested in creativity issues, ways to help teachers deal with unmotivated groups and designing materials based on neurobiological research findings. When he doesn't teach, Chaz enjoys playing his beloved guitars. A-not-so-bad blues guitarist, Chaz fronts a band of five called "Bluesiana". His motto is *docendo discimus* (when one teaches, two learn).

Dulip Singh Ranjet Singh has been in the TESOL business since 1980, having taught in schools in Pahang and Sarawak. He has a BA (First Class Hons) in TESOL from the University of Manchester, UK and an MSc in TESOL from UPM Serdang. Dulip is a teacher educator with Maktab Perguruan Tun Abdul Razak, Kota Samarahan in Sarawak.

Flora Debora Floris is a lecturer at the English Department and English Language Teaching Centre, Petra Christian University, Indonesia. She is in charge of developing the English Syllabus for all faculty members and students. She holds an MA in ELT from the Institute for English Language Education, Assumption University, Thailand.

Hitomi Masuhara is a Senior Lecturer in the School of Languages in Leeds Metropolitan University, where she acts as Research Award Coordinator for PhD students and Course Leader for the MA in Materials Development for Language Teaching. She is a founding member and Secretary of the Materials Development Association (MATSDA). She has taught at the secondary and tertiary levels in Japan, Singapore and in England. She has also helped to run Materials

Development Workshops, often for the Ministry of Education, in Argentina, Botswana, Bulgaria, China, Mauritius, Mexico, Seychelles, South Africa and in Vietnam. Her publications include seven coursebooks (Japan, China, Singapore, Ethiopia, Sub-Saharan African countries), journal articles (e.g. ELT), MET), book chapters (e.g. "Materials Development in Language Teaching," CUP; "Developing Materials for Language Teaching," Continuum) and books (e.g. *Developing Language Course Materials*, RELC). Her main interests are the role of the brain in language acquisition, materials and teacher development. She loves dancing, yoga and art appreciation.

Jayakaran Mukundan is Associate Professor at the Faculty of Educational Studies, UPM. He did his doctorate in English Language Teaching Materials. His latest book on the subject is *Readings on ELT Materials I* (UPM Press, 2003). Apart from writing academic texts, he has also written storybooks and readers for young adults. He is listed as an expert in Class Readers, having served the Ministry of Education, Malaysia from 1989 to 1997 in *The Class Reader Programme National Committee*. His major work in this area, which he co-wrote with Ting Su Hie and Ali Abdul Ghani is *Class Readers: Theory and Practice* (Longman, 1998). Jayakaran Mukundan has been Chair of the Malaysia International Conference on English Language Teaching (MICELT) since 1996. He manages a website, www.micelt.com.my and is Editor of an ELT magazine, *JUST ENGLISH*. He recently was appointed Director of the Extensive Reading Foundation (ERF).

Kaarthiyaini Supramaniam is an English lecturer at the Language Academy, UiTM Alor Gajah, Melaka. She holds a Master's degree from UPM. She has taught diploma and degree students from various disciplines. Her current research is into oral presentations.

Marc Helgesen is a well-known writer and teacher-trainer. He is the author of over 100 professional articles, book chapters and textbooks including the popular *English Firsthand* series (Longman) and "Listening" in *Practical English Language Teaching*, David Nunan ed., McGraw-Hill. Marc has been a featured speaker at KoTESOL, JALT, ThaiTESOL and other conferences. He is particularly interested in language planning, extensive reading and brain-friendly teaching.

Mohamad Fadhili bin Yahaya is a language lecturer in Universiti Teknologi Mara, Perlis. He has over ten years of experience teaching in schools and higher institutions. His areas of interest include individual variations and TESOL.

Mohd Asri Mohd Noor is a lecturer with Universiti Teknologi MARA Malaysia (UiTM) at the Arau Campus, Perlis Indera Kayangan. He received his BEd (TESL) (Hons) from Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia and MSc in Educational

Management from Universiti Utara Malaysia. His current research interests include teaching and learning of reading and writing, syllabus and materials development, assessment and evaluation, Technology Assisted Language Learning and Portfolio Development, evaluation and assessment. He is a strong supporter of Liverpool FC and currently lives in Jitra, Kedah.

Noor Anita Mohamed is an Assistant Manager with Educational Trends Sdn Bhd, Malaysia. She received her LLB (Hons) and MBA from University of Wales, Cardiff. Her current research interests include e-learning, materials development and evaluation, as well as instructional design in Information Technology Supported Environments. She is also interested in Computer Supported Collaborative Work for Teaching and Learning. She loves Italian cuisine and manages a ladle rather well. She lives and works hard in Kuala Lumpur.

Rita Abdul Rahman Ramakrishna is a lecturer at the Kolej Universiti Teknikal Kebangsaan Malaysia, Melaka. She holds a BEd TESL (Hons) and an MA in English Language Studies (TESL) from Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia. She previously taught at Multimedia University and has five years of teaching experience at tertiary level. Her areas of research interest include Language Testing and Evaluation, ESP and Syllabus Design.

Safiah Sidek graduated with a Bachelor of Business Economics from Brock University, Ontario, Canada and a Master of Science (TESL) from Universiti Putra Malaysia. She previously taught in Multimedia University and is currently lecturing in Kolej Universiti Teknikal Kebangsaan Malaysia, Melaka. She has experience teaching language proficiency and TESL courses both at secondary and tertiary levels. Her areas of research interest include Second Language Acquisition and Language Varieties.

Samsiah Abdul Hamid is currently an English Language lecturer in the Department of Languages and Communication, Faculty of Management and Economics, KUSTEM. She obtained her Bachelor's degree in TESL from the North Texas State University and a Master's degree from the University of North Texas, U.S.A. Her areas of interest include second language acquisition with emphasis on language teaching methodology, motivation and attitudes, Free Voluntary Reading and generic skills.

Saratha S. N. taught English and Literature in English in secondary schools from 1977 to 1997. She has helped prepare teaching files for Class Readers under the Schools Division, teaching notes and exercises under the Curriculum Development Centre for Literature and storyboards for secondary schools under the Smart Schools Project. She joined UiTM in 1997.

Sharimllah Devi Ramachandran graduated with a BA (Ed) Hons and an MA (Linguistics) from Universiti Sains Malaysia. She has five years of experience and has served as a lecturer in Han Chiang College (Penang), Olympia College (Penang) and Multimedia University. She is currently serving as a lecturer in Kolej Universiti Teknikal Kebangsaan Malaysia, Melaka. Her areas of interest are Teacher Education, Leadership in Education and Teaching Methods specifically, Translation Method, TESL and ESP.

Sheela Paramasivam, MA (Universiti Putra Malaysia) is a language lecturer in the Language Academy, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Melaka. She teaches English courses for diploma and degree students at the university. Her areas of interest are in English Language Teaching, ESP and Literature. Her current research is into oral presentations.

Shivcharan Kaur has taught English at UiTM Melaka since 1985. She presented her latest paper in December 2004, entitled "Teaching Portfolios-Practice and Possibilities" at UiTM Melaka's Academic Conference for Excellence. She is a distinguished Toastmaster, a member of Melaka Theatre Group and a MELTA member. Her interests include promoting learner autonomy. She has also helped set up the SAC at UiTM Melaka.

Siti Mina Tamah has been a full-time lecturer at the English Department of Widya Mandala Catholic University, Surabaya, Indonesia since 1989. She has great interest in language teaching methodology. The subjects she teaches are, among others, Paper Writing, TEFL and Curriculum and Materials Development.

Tan Bee Tin started her career as an English language teacher in Myanmar. She has taught various English courses and teacher training programmes at the University of Yangon (Myanmar) and at Assumption University, Bangkok. She is currently a lecturer at the Department of Applied Language Studies and Linguistics, the University of Auckland, New Zealand. Her main research interests are materials development, studies of academic discourse and the issue of language and learning in higher education. She has presented papers at various conferences in the UK, Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, Uzbekistan and has also published articles in international journals and conference proceedings.

Tan Lee Hoon has been a teacher-trainer since 1994. She is currently a lecturer in the English Language Department of Tun Abdul Razak Teachers' Training College. She obtained her BEd (Hons) TESOL from Edinburgh, UK and her MSc TESL from Universiti Putra Malaysia. She has been a co-ordinator for self-access materials and has also helped to develop modules for language teaching.

INTERACTION-ORIENTED DESIGN FOR DEVELOPING INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

Siti Mina Tamah

Workshop Objectives

This workshop is expected to enable the participants:

- a. to explore a range of interactive exercises injecting the seven functions of language
- b. to appreciate the importance of adapting existing materials creatively
- c. to experience a model of cooperative class where cooperative learning takes place

Workshop “Commandments”

First Commandment: workshop participants are to attempt to do their best

Second Commandment: workshop participants are to work cooperatively

Workshop Underlying Theories:

Functions of Language

Searle (1976) quoted in Levinson (1983:240) points out five kinds of language functions. The five macro classes of illocutionary acts (see Coulthard, 1985:24) proposed by Searle are: (1) *Representative* – language is used to commit speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition of which the typical examples are asserting and concluding, (2) *Directives* – language is used to get the addresser to do something (requesting, questioning are its typical examples), (3) *Commissives*: language is used to commit the speaker to some future course of action (promising, threatening, offering are its typical examples), (4) *Expressives*: language is used to express a psychological state (thanking, apologizing, welcoming, congratulating are its typical examples), (5) *Declarations*: language is used to effect immediate changes in the institutional state of affairs and to rely on elaborate extra-linguistic institutions (excommunicating, declaring war, firing from employment are its typical examples).

Cook (1989:25-26) considering the seven elements of communication (addresser, addressee, channel, message form, topic, code and setting) puts forward seven sorts of language functions. They are as follows:

This has been presented at 1st International Conference on ELT Materials at UPM Malaysia on April 28-29, 2005 (workshop session) and published in J. Mukundan (Ed.) 2006. *Focus in ELT Materials*. Pearson Longman.

The emotive function: communicating the inner states and emotions of the addresser ('Oh no!', 'Fantastic', 'Ugh!', and swear words used as exclamations).

The directive function: seeking to affect the behaviour of the addressee ('Please help me!', 'Shut up!', 'I'm warning you!').

The phatic function: opening the channel or checking that it is working, either for social reasons ('Hello', 'Lovely weather', 'Do you come here often?') or for practical ones ('Can you hear me?', 'Are you still there?', 'Can you see the blackboard from the back of the room?', 'Can you read my writing?').

The poetic function: in which the particular form chosen is the essence of the message. (The advertising slogan BEANZ MEINZ HEINZ would lose its point if it were paraphrased as 'If you are buying beans, you will naturally buy Heinz.')

The referential function: carrying information.

The metalinguistic function: focusing attention upon the code itself, to clarify it or to renegotiate it ('What does this word mean?', 'This bone is known as "femur"', ' "Will" and "shall" mean the same thing nowadays'). This book has largely metalinguistic function.

The contextual function: creating a particular kind of communication ('Right, let's start the lecture', 'It's just a game').

Richards (2001: 155, 179 -182) referring to Van Ek and Trim (1998) presents 126 functions of language. These functions are grouped into 6 categories: (1) imparting and seeking factual information, (2) expressing and finding out attitudes, (3) deciding on courses of action, (4) socializing (5) structuring discourse, and (6) communication repair. The assumption to analyze the basic functions of language is that "mastery of individual functions will result in overall communicative ability" (Richards, 2001:155)

Having depicted language functions put forward by those linguists, the writer is now presenting the synthesis of those language functions. Careful reading of the explanation given in each function discussed above leads the writer to conclude that there are 7 language functions. They are (1) referential function, (2) personal function, (3) directive function, (4) metalinguistic function, (5) phatic function, (6) commissive function, and (7) poetic function.

Learner-centeredness

Learners will, as claimed by proponents of a learner-centered approach, bring different belief and attitude about the nature of language learning. Concerning

This has been presented at 1st International Conference on ELT Materials at UPM Malaysia on April 28-29, 2005 (workshop session) and published in J. Mukundan (Ed.) 2006. *Focus in ELT Materials*. Pearson Longman.

this idea, Nunan (1995:178) more particularly points out: “A learner centred approach is based on the belief that learners will bring to the learning situation different beliefs and attitudes about the nature of language and language learning and that these beliefs and attitudes need to be taken into consideration in the selection of content and learning experiences.”

Brown (2001) underscores some characteristics of learner-centeredness. They are:

- techniques that focus on or account for learners’ needs, styles, and goals.
- techniques that give some control to the student (group work or strategy training, for example).
- curricula that include the consultation and input of student and that do not presuppose objectives in advance.
- techniques that allow for student creativity and innovation
- techniques that enhance a student’s sense of competence and self-worth.

(Brown, 2001:46-47)

Encouraging teachers to implement learner-centered instruction, Brown (2001:47) further states that this sort of instruction will help provide students with a sense of “ownership” of their learning and as a consequence motivate them intrinsically.

Implementing learner-centeredness does not mean that the teacher hands over rights to the students. It is not a devaluing of the teacher’s professional role if the teacher ‘takes a back seat’ (using the term of Richards (1998: 52)). Nunan (1999:12) argues: “ ... learner-centered instruction is not a matter of handing over rights and powers to learners in a unilateral way. Nor does it involve devaluing the teacher. Rather, it is a matter of educating learners so that they can gradually assume greater responsibility for their own learning.”

The idea of learner-centeredness is partly an attempt to involve more student participation in class. In other words, the shift from the traditional teacher-fronted classroom to learner-fronted classroom is likely to immerge from the question “What is the most effective method of teaching?” McKeachie (1994:144) argues that the answer is “Students teaching other students.” One typical way to realize this is employing group work.

Group Work

Group work is employed in many aspects of language instruction. It is in fact a form of learner activation. Besides giving practice of oral fluency, group work fosters learner responsibility and independence, improves motivation and contributes to a feeling of cooperation and warmth in class (Ur, 2000:232).

This has been presented at 1st International Conference on ELT Materials at UPM Malaysia on April 28-29, 2005 (workshop session) and published in J. Mukundan (Ed.) 2006. *Focus in ELT Materials*. Pearson Longman.

Group work is undoubtedly a social activity. A constructivist is in favor of work group as learning is believed to be a social activity. To this point, Kaplan (2002) claims: "Learning is a social activity: our learning is intimately associated with our connection with other human beings ... Conversations, interactions with others and collaborations are an integral aspect of learning."

Brown (2001:177) defines group work as "... a multiplicity of techniques in which two or more students are assigned a task that involves collaboration and self-initiated language". In brief the students are given chance to work together. One of the major purposes of group work is, Brown (2001:177) continues saying, giving students more opportunity to speak.

Relating it to classroom interaction, Brown (2001:178-9) puts forward four advantages of group work. It generates interactive language. It offers an embracing affective climate. It promotes student responsibility and autonomy, and it is a step toward individualizing instruction.

The success of group work depends on effective and careful organization. Ur (2000:234) suggests 4 sections to consider: presentation, process, ending, and feedback. In **presentation** section, the teacher gives the instruction before giving out material or dividing the class into groups. In **process** section, the teacher monitors and intervenes to among others provide general support and help students having difficulty. In **ending** section, the teacher sets a time limit. In **feedback** section, the teacher most importantly expresses appreciation of the effort that has been invested and its results and takes part in among others giving the right solution.

Workshop Materials

The original material (taken from Cambridge IELTS 3)

[Note: The original material is not revealed completely; the writer highlights merely the part that is going to be used in the workshop which is allocated for 1 hour only]

THE RISKS OF CIGARETTE SMOKE

Discovered in the early 1800s and named nicotianine, the only essence now called nicotine is the main active ingredient of tobacco. Nicotine, however, is only a small component of cigarette smoke, which contains more than 4,700 chemical compounds, including 43 cancer-causing substances. In recent times, scientific research has been providing evidence that years of cigarette smoking vastly increases the risk of developing fatal medical conditions.

In addition to being responsible for more than 85 per cent of lung cancers, smoking is associated with cancers of, amongst others, the mouth, stomach

and, kidneys, and is thought to cause about 14 per cent of leukemia and cervical cancers. In 1990, smoking caused more than 84,000 deaths, mainly resulting from such problem as pneumonia, bronchitis and influenza. Smoking, it is believed, is responsible for 30 per cent of all deaths from cancer and clearly represents the most important preventable cause of cancer in countries like the United States today.

Passive smoking, the breathing in of the side-stream from the burning of tobacco between puffs or of the smoke exhaled by a smoker, also causes a serious health risk. A report published in 1992 by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) emphasized the health dangers, especially from side-stream smoke. This type of smoke contains more, smaller particles and is therefore more likely to be deposited deep in the lungs. On the basis of this report, the EPA has classified environmental tobacco smoke in the highest risk category for causing cancer.

As an illustration of the health risks, in the case of a married couple where one partner is a smoker and one a non-smoker, the latter is believed to have a 30 per cent higher risk of death from heart disease because of passive smoking. The risk of lung cancer also increases over the years of exposure and the figure jumps to 80 per cent if the spouse has been, smoking for four packs a day for 20 years. It has been calculated that 17 per cent of cases of lung cancer attributed to high levels of exposure to second-hand tobacco smoke during childhood and adolescence.

A more recent study by researchers at the University of California at San Francisco (UCSF) has shown that second-hand cigarette smoke does more harm to non-smokers than to smokers. Leaving aside the philosophical question of whether anyone should have to breathe someone else's cigarette smoke, the report suggests that the smoke experienced by many people in their daily lives is enough to produce substantial adverse effects on a person's heart and lungs.

[the last 3 paragraphs are deleted]

[The exercises following the text are of 4 sorts; they are displayed as follows:]

Choose one phrase from the list of phrases below to complete each of the following sentences:

[etc.]

Classify the following statements as being

- A *a finding of the UCSF study*
- B *an opinion of the UCSF study*
- C *a finding of the EPA report*
- D *an assumption of consultants to the tobacco industry*

[etc.]

Choose the appropriate letters **A-D** and write them:

[etc]

Do the following statement reflect the claims of the writer in Reading Passage?

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| YES | <i>If the statement reflect the claims of the writer</i> |
| NO | <i>If the statement contradict the claims of the writer</i> |
| NOT GIVEN | <i>If it is impossible to say what the writer thinks about this</i> |

[etc]

The Modified Material (Interaction-oriented Teaching Material)

Task 1: Read the following text silently.

THE RISKS OF CIGARETTE SMOKE

1) Discovered in the early 1800s and named nicotianine, the only essence now called nicotine is the main active ingredient of tobacco. Nicotine, however, is only a small component of cigarette smoke, which contains more than 4,700 chemical compounds, including 43 cancer-causing substances. In recent times, scientific research has been providing evidence that years of cigarette smoking vastly increases the risk of developing fatal medical conditions.

2) In addition to being responsible for more than 85 per cent of lung cancers, smoking is associated with cancers of, amongst others, the mouth, stomach and, kidneys, and is thought to cause about 14 per cent of leukemia and cervical cancers. In 1990, smoking caused more than 84,000 deaths, mainly resulting from such problem as pneumonia, bronchitis and influenza. Smoking, it is believed, is responsible for 30 per cent of all deaths from cancer and clearly represents the most important preventable cause of cancer in countries like the United States today.

3) Passive smoking, the breathing in of the side-stream from the burning of tobacco between puffs or of the smoke exhaled by a smoker, also causes a serious health risk. A report published in 1992 by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) emphasized the health dangers, especially from side-stream smoke. This type of smoke contains more, smaller particles and is therefore more likely to be deposited deep in the lungs. On the basis of this report, the EPA has classified environmental tobacco smoke in the highest risk category for causing cancer.

4) As an illustration of the health risks, in the case of a married couple where one partner is a smoker and one a non-smoker, the latter is believed to have a 30 per cent higher risk of death from heart disease because of

passive smoking. The risk of lung cancer also increases over the years of exposure and the figure jumps to 80 per cent if the spouse has been smoking for four packs a day for 20 years. It has been calculated that 17 per cent of cases of lung cancer attributed to high levels of exposure to second-hand tobacco smoke during childhood and adolescence.

5) A more recent study by researchers at the University of California at San Francisco (UCSF) has shown that second-hand cigarette smoke does more harm to non-smokers than to smokers. Leaving aside the philosophical question of whether anyone should have to breathe someone else's cigarette smoke, the report suggests that the smoke experienced by many people in their daily lives is enough to produce substantial adverse effects on a person's heart and lungs.

Exercise A:

Choose one phrase from the list of phrases below to complete each of the following sentences:

Passive smoking ...

- a. includes reviews of studies in its reports.
- b. Argues for stronger action against smoking in public places.
- c. Is one of the two most preventable causes of deaths.
- d. Is more likely to be at risk from passive smoking diseases.
- e. Is more harmful to non-smokers than to smokers.

Exercise B:

Classify the following statements as being

- A *a finding of the UCSF study*
- B *an opinion of the UCSF study*
- C *a finding of the EPA report*
- D *an assumption of consultants to the tobacco industry*

There is a philosophical question as to whether people should have to inhale others' smoke.

Exercise C:

Choose the appropriate letters:

According to information in the text, pneumonia

- a. is responsible for 84,000 deaths each year
- b. is strongly linked to cigarette smoking

- c. is strongly linked to lung cancer
- d. result in 30% of deaths per year

Exercise D:

Do the following statements reflect the claims of the writer in the text?

YES	<i>If the statement reflect the claims of the writer</i>
NO	<i>If the statement contradict the claims of the writer</i>
NOT GIVEN	<i>If it is impossible to say what the writer thinks about this</i>

1. 30% of deaths in the United States are caused by smoking-related diseases.
2. If one partner in a marriage smokes, the other is likely to take up smoking.

Assignment:

Write the adjectives appearing in the text and find the opposite and/or the synonym of the words.

[Note: The items in each exercise are not revealed completely; the writer takes merely 1 or 2 items since the workshop is restricted to 1 hour only]

Task 2: Find a word from the text and write it on a piece of paper.

Task 3: Share the word you've chosen (tell your friend next to you why you choose the word).

Task 4: Move around to find a partner. Use the two words creatively. For example: your word is SMOKE; your friend's CANCER. You can use the two words creatively resulting in the following piece of work:

smoke
go away
away from me
cancer
go far
far from me

Task 5: Form home teams @ 4 students. There are 4 exercises following the reading text. Each student will be the expert of one exercise. Each home team decides a captain who will ensure that every member gets a different share.

Task 6: Form the expert teams now. Say goodbye to your home team members. In your expert team, get the task completed. Discuss it to make sure you

This has been presented at 1st International Conference on ELT Materials at UPM Malaysia on April 28-29, 2005 (workshop session) and published in J. Mukundan (Ed.) 2006. *Focus in ELT Materials*. Pearson Longman.

become the expert as you are responsible for assisting your home team members later. Take important notes to help you share what you've got in the expert team when you 'come back home'.

Task 7: Go back to your home team. Help one another so that every member gets the exercises completed. Encourage one another to do the best.

Task 8: Discuss how you're going to take care of the home assignment.

Careful analysis to the modified material above indicates that Tasks 1-3 are designed to bring about referential and personal functions. From Task 4, poetic, directive and personal functions are expected to appear. Task 5 is designed to bring out directive and/or commissive function. Metalinguistic function is brought about from Task 6. Task 7 is designed to bring out referential, phatic and commissive functions, and Task 8 will bring out directive and commissive functions.

Workshop Participants in Action

In every workshop, the participants are to be actively involved in performing some tasks. The workshop participants are briefly supposed to be in action especially to achieve the predetermined workshop objectives. The facilitator of the workshop then leads the workshop following the procedure as follows:

1. Greet the workshop participants and inform the objectives of the workshop.
2. Tell them they will experience a model of interaction-oriented instruction.
3. Distribute the workshop material as displayed in 4.2
4. Ask the workshop participants to do Task 1.
5. Distribute a piece of paper for the students to do Task 2.
6. Order the workshop participants to turn to the person next to them and to do Task 3.
7. Make sure the workshop participants understand Task 4 by highlighting the example.
8. Ask the workshop participants to stand up and move around to complete Task 4.
9. Divide the workshop participants into groups of 4 forming home teams.
10. Ask each home team to choose a captain and inform that the captain's job is to ensure that every member gets a different share (Task 5 is carried out).
11. Make sure that each participant has determined an exercise to take care of which expert he/she will become – Expert of Exercise 1, 2, 3, or 4.
12. Regroup the workshop participants forming the expert teams.
13. Move around to assist the experts and ensure Task 6 is performed.

This has been presented at 1st International Conference on ELT Materials at UPM Malaysia on April 28-29, 2005 (workshop session) and published in J. Mukundan (Ed.) 2006. *Focus in ELT Materials*. Pearson Longman.

14. Stop the workshop participants and ask them to say good bye to their expert team members.
15. Ask the workshop participants to get back to their home team.
16. Move around to assist and ensure Task 7 is carried out.
17. Stop the workshop participants and ask them to do Task 8.
18. Inform the participants that the model of interaction-oriented instruction is over.
19. Review the related literature, namely functions of language.
20. Encourage the workshop participants to find out what functions of language are manipulated in each of the task in the model.
21. Ask 1 participant to share what he/she has found.
22. Distribute an instructional material – a text – taken from a commercially published textbook.
23. Assign the workshop participants to work in groups to modify the existing instructional material by devising interactive exercises manipulating the seven language functions.
24. Move around to assist and ensure the job is carried out.
25. Ask 1 group to share the result of their group work.
26. Provide feedback.

References

- Brown, D. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* (2nd ed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc. 2001.
- Cook, G. *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Kaplan, E. 2002. *Constructivism as a Theory*. Retrieved 20 November 2004 from <http://online.sfsu.edu/~foreman/itec800/finalprojects/eitankaplan/pages/classroom>
- Levinson, S. C. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- McKeachie, W. J. *Teaching Tips: Strategies, Research, and Theory for College and University Teachers*. Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company, 1994.
- Nunan, D. *Language Teaching Methodology: A Textbook for Teachers*. New York: Phoenix ELT, 1995.
- Richards, J. C. *Beyond Training*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Richards, J. C. *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Ur, P. *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory* (6th printing). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.